

Questions and Answers for Networx Universal and Enterprise RFPs

#	Acquisition	RFP Section	Redacted Question	Redacted Answer
1026	Universal	B.2.15.2.2	Table B.2.15.2.2-2 requires pricing based on the user data rate. The cost metric for satellite services is transponder bandwidth. The provider can make assumptions regarding satellite link parameters, include these in the pricing and offer very low prices. The Government when ordering services may find that the assumptions are not applicable to the Government's need and have to procure service either from another contract vehicle or through a Networx contract mode. Will GSA allow satellite services be priced based on transponder bandwidth?	No, the Government will not base FSS pricing on transponder bandwidth. Any assumptions made by the offeror regarding satellite link parameters should be clearly stated in its proposal.
1027	Both	B.2.4	5. Internet Services - Clarification of Embedded, and Independent classification in Internet Services. - Please provide greater definition to the term "Embedded". Does it mean that there can only be one price for both Port and Access or does it mean 2 separate line item prices that are ordered as a bundle? - Does the term "Independent" mean that GSA expects Cable, DSL and other access to be purchased separately from the IP Service? These services today are always bundled with Internet Services. There is no concept today of Customer Provided Access for these services as they tend to be bundled services.	1. For embedded access there are no separate charges for access - only port and transport charges are allowed. The contractor may recover access costs through these charges. 2. Independent access is purchased separately from another contract. No access charges from the Networx contract are allowed. Section B makes no assumptions regarding the availability or technological feasibility of independent access in particular cases.
1028	Both	(Unknown)	In the answer to question 772, the Government addressed only the first reference section in the submitted question. In the RFPs, there are numerous occurrences of the term "commercially available." Can the offerors assume the phrase 'commercially available', "commercially available from offeror", and "where commercially available from offeror" are interchangeable?	The term "commercially available" is generally intended to mean commercially available from the offeror/contractor, but must always be taken in context, since it sometimes refers to an attribute of a service (e.g., a standard or interface in Section C) and sometimes to the geographic availability of a service (per Attachment J.2).
1029	Both	B.2.4.1.2.2, B.3.1	Section B.2.4.1.2.2 of the RFP states, "Where dedicated access is used to connect the SDP to the contractor's designated connecting Point-of-Presence (POP), (e.g., for intranet and extranet service), dedicated access prices shall be listed in Section B.3." Section B.3.1 of the RFP states, "For any specific Wireline Access type, all locations served from the same SWC shall have the same prices." However, DIA is not a long distance service and has different POPs than long distance services such as IP-VPN. Under the current RFP structure, bidders are not permitted to offer their best prices due to the different set of POPs and vendor options (ILEC/CLEC/IXC). Will the Government consider: - making access pricing for DIA ICB to be quoted at the time of service order? - allowing a separate set of dedicated access pricing for DIA?	After careful review, the Government has decided that the current pricing structure for dedicated access satisfies its requirements.

Questions and Answers for Networx Universal and Enterprise RFPs

#	Acquisition	RFP Section	Redacted Question	Redacted Answer
1030	Both	B.2.7.2, B.2.4.1	GSA in its question and answers posted July 21, 2005 under number 574 references that the intranet/extranet tables within IPS will be removed in an upcoming amendment. However, Section B.2.7.2 indicates that the Transport will be found in the IPS section. Where does the Government suggest that the PBIP-VPN transport will be located if it removes the intranet/extranet table?	The PBIP-VPN transport will still be found in the IPS Section B.2.4.1. The Internet ports in the remaining IPS pricing tables will be used for PBIP-VPN transport.
1031	Both	B.2.5.3, B.2.5.4	GSA's response to this question raises additional questions concerning the mileage calculation for these services. The only mileage in the context of the RFP is mileage for POP-to-POP transport. The POPs and their V&H coordinates are specified in Table B.6.5-1, and the mileage calculation is specified in footnote 3 to Section B.1.3.1.3. The GSA's response to the answer to question 986 states that these two services do not use access, but rather are "facility based end-to-end" services. If there is no access, there presumably are no POPs. Will the Government please specify in Sections B.2.5-3 and B.2.5-4 which pairs of V&H coordinates (where they come from, and what they represent) are to be used to calculate the mileage required for pricing DFS and WDM? Based on the assumption that no POPs are required for DFS and WDM, will the Government confirm that these two services do not need entries in Table B.6.5-8, which specifies which services are offered at each POP?	The two services do use access and do require POPs. The V&H coordinates of the POPs are to be used for calculating distance for DFS and OWS. Thus, these two services do require entries in B.6.5-8 which specifies which services are offered at each POP. The RFP was amended to more clearly indicate that both DFS and OWS are transport services within Section B.2.5 that require POP to POP pricing. Additionally, CLINs were added to WLNAA and WLNAS for DFS and OWS access fibers and circuits, respectively.
1033	Both	B.2.3.2	The RFP mandates that "ATMS provides connection-oriented, transmission service with scalable port speeds of DS-1, DS-3, OC-3, and OC-12. In addition, ATMS provides E-1 and E-3 port speeds for terminations outside of the U.S." However, this conflicts with Section B.2.3.2.3 / Page # B-44 – B-46, which does not include CLINs for E-1 or E-3 ATM port speeds. We recommend that CLINs for E-1 & E-3 ATM port speeds be added to Table B.2.3.2.3-5; consistent w/GSA response to redacted question #983. Would the Government be agreeable to adding CLINs for E-1 & E-3 ATM port speeds?	Since Table B.2.3.2.3-5 is a price table and does not include CLINs and descriptions we are assuming that the vendor is referring to Table B.2.3.2.3-6 ATMS Non-Domestic Port Pricing Instructions. The requested E1 and E3 ATM port speeds are already included in this table. No change needs to be made.
1034	Both	B.2.2.3	The Government identifies a number of CLINs as "NSP" meaning associated costs are to be incorporated in the basic service. However, several CLINs are for enhanced features which are typically customized in commercial offerings and are not part of basic Toll Free Service. This bundled pricing approach unfairly burdens those Toll Free Service users who do not need the enhanced features by forcing them to subsidize those who do. Furthermore, since there is no predicted volume for these NSP items each contractor is compelled to make their own guess as to what the usage might be. This independent guessing result in wide variability in costs and therefore wide variability in price which makes a fair evaluation of competing offers a subjective rather than objective exercise.	No. After careful review, the CLIN structure represents the Government requirement.

Questions and Answers for Networx Universal and Enterprise RFPs

#	Acquisition	RFP Section	Redacted Question	Redacted Answer
			<p>We strongly recommend that GSA modify the pricing CLINs to delete "NSP" and allow contractors to provide feature specific pricing in accordance with commercial practice. If a particular contractor chose to offer a particular CLIN at a zero price where others may elect to charge then the government will have a clear, fair and objective means to make a vendor selection. CLINs affected include: 0039004 – Alternate Routing (Cascade Routing) 0039007 – ANI Based Routing 0039046 – Make Busy Arrangement 0039047 – Network Call Distributor Given the wide range of complexities and network resources to support the TFS features noted, we recommend that GSA modify the Universal and Enterprise RFPs to allow the referenced CLINs to be separately priced so that all users will not be unnecessarily charged high basic service rates for features they may not need or desire and contractors will be able to be evaluated in a fair and objective manner. Would the Government be agreeable to the above change?</p>	
1035	Both	B.2.2.3, C	<p>The Government appears to have regressed to the original pricing and requirement structure of the FTS2001 RFP. Under this structure the agencies are restricted by not being allowed to "pick and choose" their Toll Free features and trapped in an "all or nothing" type of price and service. For example: Under the feature Call Prompter there are requirements for "announcement messages", "multi-tiered prompting (menus)", "transcription" and others.</p> <p>While an agency needing all of these requirements benefits by having them bundled together agencies requiring just "multi-tiered prompting" are penalized because they are left paying for requirements they do not need or want. Another example of this is the IVR requirement which includes "announcement messages", "transcription", "text to speech", "speech recognition", "fax back" and others. Again this only benefits the agencies needing all of these features. The FTS2001 contract was eventually modified with the "a la carte" structure do to the restrictions of original FTS2001 structure. Unbundle the requirements or provide an alternate "a la carte" technical and pricing structure. Would the Government be agreeable to the above change?</p>	No. After careful review, the CLIN structure represents the Government requirement.

Questions and Answers for Networx Universal and Enterprise RFPs

#	Acquisition	RFP Section	Redacted Question	Redacted Answer
1036	Both	B.4.9.2	<p>a. Model#s Background: Wireless SED pricing and Wireless SED Models change frequently, due to supply and demand, replacement by the manufacturer of a wireless phone with a new model, technology improvements, etc. Since SED models change rapidly, setting up individual CLINs for each wireless SED model# is burdensome, requiring frequent contract modifications, thereby delaying the Government from receiving the latest SEDs and lower pricing. Comment: Suggest that model#s in Table B.4.9.2-1 be optional, allowing the Government to receive the best price and products. The latest wireless SED price schedule for each model# would be issued separately by the wireless contractor, and GSA and other Government agencies can order these wireless SEDs under CLINs in the Networx contract.</p> <p>b. Official Manufacturer's List Price Background: Wireless contractors do not establish pricing as a discount to an "Official Manufacturer's List Price," but use commercial pricing methods instead. Comment: Suggest the "Official Manufacturer's List Price" be deleted in Table B.4.9.2-1, and the "Percentage Discount Off Official List Price" column be deleted in Table B.4.9.2-2.</p>	<p>SEDs for wireless services will use the same pricing provisions established for all SEDs. For purposes of Section H.11, Electronic Access to Contract, contractors will be required to post the final price to the Government and not the manufacturer's list price, the discount percentage or the discount class.</p>
1037	Both	B.4.3.2	<p>The RFP in section B.4.3.2 defines a "base unit" as "...containing all minimally required elements..." and "...shall include only those underlying base components that are needed to support the common or shared functions of the equipment before adding configurable components." This could involve more than one piece of SED which may be sold separately. For example, a router could require power supply, software, cable, etc, which could all be defined as being elements required to the base unit (the router) at the minimum to make it operational and may not be considered configurable components. Due to the requirements to provide List Price and device class discounts, the contractor would not be able to provide only one CLIN for one 'base unit' since there could be multiple SEDs under one "base unit" requiring separate and different CLINs and device class discounts.</p> <p>The SEDs CLIN table for the different technologies does not clearly explain how base units should be priced if there are more than one SED involved. Would the government provide an updated CLIN table which clearly explains how to price Base Units which involve multiple SEDs with different device class discounts?</p>	<p>The base unit of a package SED is as described in Section B.4.3.2. Question is correct in stating that "a router could require power supply, software, cable, etc, which could all be defined as being elements required to the base unit (the router) at the minimum to make it operational and may not be considered configurable components". Consistent with the description in B.4.3.2, such elements of a router would generally be part of the base unit for a router in Networx and would not be considered separately priced configurable components. There will be one DNRC CLIN per base unit. The base unit will have one Manufacturer's List Price and one Device Class Discount.</p> <p>The list price for a base unit, therefore, may well consist of the sum of the list prices for an itemization of individual elements underlying the base unit, with such itemization provide to the Government pursuant to the requirements in Sections L.34.1.8 and Sections L.34.5.6. It will be common for multiple rows in the tables in Section L.34.1.8 to have the same DNRC CLIN. The Government expects that the Device Class Discount will be consistent for contractor-defined general categories or more specific subcategories of SEDs from the same manufacturer.</p>

Questions and Answers for Networx Universal and Enterprise RFPs

#	Acquisition	RFP Section	Redacted Question	Redacted Answer
1038	Both	B.4	<p>The RFP in section B.4 has allowed us to create a seven digit CLIN for each piece of equipment starting with the digits "09". This will mathematically allow for 10,000 CLINs. There may potentially be 6 CLINs associated with 1 SED, (DNRC, DMRC, MMRC, NRC Installation, NRC Upgrade). There is a high potential to deplete all 10,000 CLINs based on the large number of SEDs required to satisfy all services (also allowing to provide the Government options for multiple brands/manufacturers). Also, there was mention from previous government responses that there will be amendments to the AOW which could potentially add more CLINs for any particular SED. How should the contractor proceed if all 10,000 CLINs starting with "09" are depleted? Could the contractor use seven digit CLINs starting with "99".</p>	CLINs for SEDs may range from 0900000-0999999, which allows for 100,000 CLINs, which is enough.
1039	Both	J	<p>Please clarify the interface requirements for the following set numbers:</p> <p>Sets 33 and 34 – Please clarify what type of interface is required when specifying an IP UNI Type. Is a SED required with a physical interface or is the Government simply looking for a handoff at the telecommunications demarcation point (SDP)?</p> <p>Set 37 – The UNI Type is specified as VOIPTS, but the Quantity is annotated with a single asterisk denoting either an IP or SONET interface. Please clarify what type of interface is required. Also, there are multiple VOIPTS UNI Types specified in C.2.7.8.3.2, Page C-185. What criteria should the Offeror use when selecting a VOIPTS UNI Type to bid?</p> <p>Sets 38 – Please clarify what type of interface is required when specifying a SONET UNI Type. Is a SED required with a physical interface or is the Government simply looking for a handoff at the telecommunications demarcation point (SDP)?</p> <p>Set 40 - The UNI Type is specified as SONET, but the Quantity is annotated with a double asterisk denoting either an Ethernet or VOIPTS interface. Please clarify what type of interface is required.</p> <p>We recommend that the Government specify physical rather than functional interfaces for Sets 33 through 40 to ensure that the proposed SEDs meet the Government's requirements for evaluation.</p> <p>Q.5: Will the Government amend Table J.5.2 to show physical interfaces for Sets 33 through 40?</p>	<p>Table J.5.2 will not be amended, however, the following information should provide better clarity:</p> <p>a. Regarding Requirement Sets 33 and 34, a SED with a physical interface is required.</p> <p>b. Regarding Requirement Set 37, SED(s) providing a gateway function with IP interface on access side and a PBX trunk interface on the SDP side is required.</p> <p>c. Regarding Requirement Set 38, SED(s) with a physical interface is required. Additional functionality includes security services, VOIPTS gateway capability (PBX trunk interfacing), and operation as an MNS node.</p> <p>d. Regarding Requirement Set 40, SED(s) with a SONET interface is required. Additional functionality includes certain security services and operation as an MNS node.</p>

Questions and Answers for Networx Universal and Enterprise RFPs

#	Acquisition	RFP Section	Redacted Question	Redacted Answer
1040	Both	J.9	<p>There are apparently several types of inconsistencies and errors remaining in the Government-provided J.9.2 and J.9.3 tables posted in the Enterprise RFP Amendment 2. These include:</p> <p>a) within individual requirements included in the tables, the entry for "Table" and entry for "Table ID," which together identify the original location of the requirement, appear to be inconsistent</p> <p>b) in a small number of instances, requirements appear to be repeated in the tables, with differences only in the "RFP Requirements" column, where the first entry contains text and the second contains only the word "DELETE"</p> <p>c) several table entries appear to be duplicated</p> <p>d) in a few cases, the text in the "RFP Requirements" column matches the RFP text corresponding to the "RFP Section" reference, except for the item list number. How should these cases be handled?</p>	<p>The RFP text takes precedence over the J.9 tables, and the offeror remains responsible for ensuring the accuracy of its response to the J.9 tables in this regard. In the cases mentioned, the offeror is specifically advised as follows:</p> <p>a) there may be instances where either the "Table" entry or the "Table ID" entry for a specific requirement in a Government-provided J.9.2 or J.9.3 table is wrong. In these cases, the offeror should confirm the correct reference in the RFP and include the correction in its offeror-provided J.9.2 or J.9.3 tables. Known instances of this sort in the Enterprise J.9.2 and J.9.3 tables for Amendment 2 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number 1 in Table 9.2.2 should reference Table J.9.1.1.2(c), not J.9.1.1.2(a) - Number 2 in Table 9.2.2 should reference Table J.9.1.1.2(c), not J.9.1.1.2(a) - Number 3 in Table 9.2.2 should reference Table J.9.1.1.2(c), not J.9.1.1.2(a) <p>- Number 4 in Table 9.2.2 should reference Table J.9.1.1.2(c), not J.9.1.1.2(a)</p> <p>- Number 19 in Table 9.2.2 should reference Table J.9.1.1.2(a)Table ID 0840, not ID 0872</p> <p>- Number 51 in Table 9.3.2 should reference Table J.9.1.1.2(d), not J.9.1.1.2(b)</p> <p>- Number 52 in Table 9.3.2 should reference Table J.9.1.1.2(d), not J.9.1.1.2(b)</p> <p>b) the Government believes that all cases of this sort involve requirements included in the wrong table in the original J.9 tables, specifically requirements included in a "Mandatory" requirements table that should have been in an "Optional" requirements table, or vice versa. In all such cases the offeror may ignore the table entry containing the word "DELETE," but shall confirm that the requirement remains in the RFP, and respond accordingly.</p> <p>c) where duplicate table entries are noted, one may be safely ignored as long as the other is addressed.</p> <p>d) errors of this sort are the self-evident result of automatic renumbering by the Government's text processing software, and may be ignored.</p> <p>Any other errors noted by offerors should be verified by way of confirmation against the corresponding RFP text, and included in the offeror-provided J.9.2 and J.9.3 tables.</p>
1041	Both	J.12.3	<p>In the Service Provisioning Intervals Table, line speeds are listed for Private Line Service and Wireline Access Service as follows: = DS1 DS1= PLS = DS3 > DS3 Is it the Government's intent that the second interval really be: DS1< PLS = DS3 so that there is no overlap in what category DS1 falls into?</p>	<p>The requirement for Private Line Service and Wireline Access Service is: "DS1<..." rather than "DS1<=..."</p>

Questions and Answers for Networx Universal and Enterprise RFPs

#	Acquisition	RFP Section	Redacted Question	Redacted Answer
1042	Enterprise	C. 3.5.1.1 and C.3.6.1.2	Do the data dictionaries described in C. 3.5.1.1 and C.3.6.1.2 count against the page limit for Volume II?	No, Data Dictionaries do NOT count against the page limit for Volume II.
1043	Universal	C. 3.5.1.1 and C.3.6.1.3	<p>Amendment 2 changed the requirement in Section C.3.7.3.2.2 for the initial submittal of training material from "Upon request" to "Included at contract award." This requirement appears to be in conflict with Section C.3.7.2.1 ID 2, which states: "The contractor shall develop and submit to GSA a Networx Training Plan describing the contractor's training program" and Section C.3.7.4.1.1, which states that the Networx Training Plan final submission is to be "15 business days after receiving GSA comment." In addition, Section C.3.7.3.2.1.1 states that the initial Course Catalog is to be submitted "Within 30 days after Notice to Proceed."</p> <p>It is the offeror's opinion that the submission times noted above for both the Networx's Training Plan and the Course Catalog are acceptable. However, based on the cost of developing course material for a IDIQ contract prior to an award, as well as the limited timeframe for development, the offeror requests that GSA reconsider the requirement for initial submittal of training material "at contract award." We suggest that the timeframe be changed to some specified period after the Training Plan is approved.</p>	The required delivery timeframe for training materials is "Upon Request."
1044	Both	J.5	In Table J.5.1 in the Universal RFP and in Table J.5.2 of Enterprise, "Ethernet" is shown as the UNI Type for a number of SEDs Requirement Sets, specifically for Nos. 4, 5, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, and 38. On the same rows for these specific Requirement Sets, the UNI Bandwidth is shown as an increment of TDM bandwidth. The bandwidth for an Ethernet connection at an SDP will normally be 10 or 100 Mbs. Will GSA clarify its intent with regard to the Ethernet-related UNI Bandwidths provided in the requirements tables? Also, for Requirement Set 17, the UNI bandwidth listed appears to be an error?	In regard to Table J.5.1 in the Universal RFP and Table J.5.2 in the Enterprise RFP, where the UNI type is shown as Ethernet, the UNI bandwidth column is indicative of the average bandwidth that would be used by each interface. As for Requirement Set No. 17, the UNI Bandwidth should be T3.
1045	Both	J.9	The Government has acknowledged that corrections and/or additions may be needed to the J.9 tables to make them fully compliant with RFP requirements, and that offerors are responsible for making the changes to ensure correct J.9 tables are submitted. If an offeror does not make a correction or addition that the Government decides after proposal submission is required in the J.9 tables, will the offeror be penalized or found non compliant during the evaluation process?	For the initial evaluation of proposals, only responses to correct Attachment J.9 entries published by the Government in the RFP, as amended, will be evaluated for compliance. Issues arising from any errors and omissions found by the Government subsequent to Amendment Two will be addressed during the discussion phase of the evaluation process. All identified errors and omissions in the Attachment J.9 tables will then be corrected by the Government in an additional RFP amendment(s) prior to the receipt of Final Proposal Revisions to ensure that all offerors are evaluated on a common basis. At that point, the Government will determine an offeror non-compliant for Attachment J.9 Cross Reference Table errors or omissions.